arXiv:1301.3229v1 [math.GT] 15 Jan 2013

CONICAL LIMIT SETS OF HYPERBOLIC SUBGROUPS

WOOJIN JEON AND KEN'ICHI OHSHIKA

Abstract. Given a hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G for which a Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i}:\partial H\to\partial G$ exists, we study the limit set Λ_H of H with respect to its action on ∂G. We prove that the set of conical limit points is exactly the subset of Λ_H consisting of the points to which the Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i}$ injects. Moreover, we show that when H is not quasi-convex in G, there exists a non-conical limit point in Λ_H

1. INTRODUCTION

In a celebrated paper [11], which was disseminated as a preprint in 1984 but was published in 2007, Cannon and Thurston considered an equivariant continuous map from the points at infinity of a closed surface group $\pi_1(S)$ to the limit set of a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold M which is a fibre bundle over S^1 with fibre S. To be more precise, what they showed is as follows. Let M be a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold M fibring over a circle where the fibre is a closed hyperbolic surface S. Then $\pi_1(M)$ contains the fibre group $\pi_1(S)$ as a normal subgroup. Let G and H be $\pi_1(M)$ and $\pi_1(S)$ respectively for the moment. We denote by ∂H and ∂G the Gromov boundaries (which are the same as the Floyd boundaries in this situation) of H and G, which are homeomorphic to S^1 and S^2 respectively. The group H acts on both ∂H and ∂G as homeomorphisms, in the latter of which we regard H as a subgroup of G. Cannon and Thurston showed that the inclusion $i:H\to G$ extends continuously to an H-equivariant surjective map $\widehat{i}:\partial H\to\partial G$. The surjectivity of $\widehat{i}$ follows from the fact that H is a normal subgroup of G. Thus $\widehat{i}$ becomes an equivariant continuous surjection from a circle to a sphere which gives a beautiful $\pi_1(S)$-invariant Peano curve. This map is called a Cannon-Thurston map and has been generalised in various settings.

The first kind of generalisation is for general finitely generated Kleinian groups. When G is a finitely generated group, we choose a base point o in $\mathbb{H}^3$ on which G acts as isometries, and consider an equivariant orbit map $\tau_o : G\to\mathbb{H}^3$. A Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{\tau}_o$ is defined to be a continuous equivariant extension of τ_o from the Gromov boundary of G to the limit set

---

Date: January 16, 2013.

[1]2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F67, 51M10, 57S25, 60J50

[2]*Key words and phrases.* Hyperbolic group, Cannon-Thurston map, Conical limit set, Convergence action.

of G. The existence of Cannon-Thurston maps for general Kleinian groups has been studied in [21, 20, 8, 24, 26, 25].

The second kind of generalisation, which is the situation we shall study in this paper, deals with the case when we have a hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G (in the sense of Gromov), both of which are assumed to be finitely generated. As in the case of Kleinian groups, we can consider an orbit map τ_e from H to a Cayley graph Γ_G of G by considering the orbit of e, where e is the origin of Γ_G, i.e. the identity element of G. It will be convenient to choose a finite generating set of G which contains a finite generating set of H. Then we can extend τ_e to an equivariant embedding i from Γ_H to Γ_G. We consider the Gromov boundaries ∂G and ∂H of G and H with respect to the word metrics, which coincide with the Gromov boundaries of Γ_G and Γ_H. When there is an equivariant continuous extension $\widehat{i} : \partial H \to \partial G$ of $i : \Gamma_H \to \Gamma_G$, we call such $\widehat{i}$ a Cannon-Thurston map. When H is a quasi-convex subgroup of G, it is easy to see that a Cannon-Thurston map exists and is a topological embedding. The above example of a fibre subgroup by Cannon and Thurston was the first one such that H is not quasi-convex in G but a Cannon-Thurston map exists. Mitra generalised this example to the case when H is an infinite normal subgroup of G in [22], and also to the case when G is a graph of groups and H is an edge or a vertex subgroup in [23], where the graph is finite and the edge and the vertex groups are quasi-isometrically embedded. Mitra in [22, 23] and also Kapovich and Benakli in [18] asked whether a Cannon-Thurston map exists for every infinite hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G. The answer is negative as was shown by Baker and Riley in [1], and Matsuda and Oguni found more general counterexamples in [19]. Recently Baker and Riley showed that a Cannon-Thurston map can exist for a hyperbolic subgroup with extremely high distortion called *hyperbolic hydra* in [2].

Recall that when a group G acts isometrically on a hyperbolic metric space X with Gromov boundary ∂X, the limit set Λ_G is defined to be the set of accumulation points of the orbit $G \cdot x$ for some $x \in X$. Studying the limit set gives valuable information on groups or the group actions. For a Kleinian group G acting on $\mathbb{H}^n$, a limit point lying on S^{n-1}_∞ is called a conical limit point when it is an accumulation point of an orbit in $\mathbb{H}^n$ contained in a fixed radial neighbourhood of a geodesic ray ending at that point. It was proved that a Kleinian group G is geometrically finite if and only if every limit point is either conical or parabolic fixed point [3, 4]. The notion of conical limit points was generalised to groups acting on a compact metrisable space T as a convergence group. In such a case, it was shown that this action is uniform if and only if every limit point is conical [9, 29].

In this paper, for a hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G for which a Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i} : \partial H \to \partial G$ exists, we shall study the set of conical limit points with respect to the H-action on ∂G. The first of our main results claims that the conical limits points coincide with the points of injective images of the Cannon-Thurston map.

Theorem 1.1. *Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G for which a Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i}:\partial H\to\partial G$ exists. Then the set of conical limit points in ∂G with respect to the H-action on ∂G coincides with the set $\{x\in\partial G \,|\, |\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)|=1\}$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality.*

In particular, if H is quasi-convex subgroup of G, then every point on the limit set Λ_H of H on ∂G is conical. It is natural to expect the converse is also true, i.e. that there would be non-conical limit points on Λ_H when H is not quasi-convex in G. This is indeed the case.

Theorem 1.2. *Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G for which a Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i}:\partial H\to\partial G$ exists. Assume that H is not quasi-convex in G. Then there exists a non-conical limit point with respect to the H-action on ∂G.*

2. Conical limit set

For $\delta\geq 0$, a geodesic metric space (X,d) is called *δ-hyperbolic* if for any geodesic triangle in X, each side of the triangle is contained in the δ-neighborhood of the union of the other two sides. We call a geodesic metric space a *hyperbolic space* (in the sense of Gromov) if it is δ-hyperbolic for some $\delta\geq 0$. A hyperbolic metric space (X,d) has a boundary at infinity ∂X called the *Gromov boundary* which can be defined as follows. We say a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in (X,d) *converges to infinity* if

$$\liminf_{i,j\to\infty}(x_i|x_j)_x=\infty$$

for some (hence every) basepoint x, where

$$(y|z)_x:=\frac{1}{2}(d(x,y)+d(x,z)-d(y,z))$$

for $x,y,z\in X$. This product $(y|z)_x$ is called the *Gromov product* of y and z with respect to x and approximates within 2δ the distance from x to any geodesic $[y,z]$ joining y,z. Two sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n\}\subset X$ converging to infinity are said to be *equivalent* if

$$\liminf_{i,j\to\infty}(x_i|y_j)_x=\infty$$

for some $x\in X$. The Gromov boundary ∂X is defined as the set of the equivalence classes of sequences converging to infinity in X. This definition is independent of the choice of the base point $x\in X$. The Gromov boundary has a natural topology coming from an extension of the Gromov product to ∂X. A finitely generated group G is called a *hyperbolic group* if its Cayley graph Γ_G is hyperbolic with respect to the word metric $d_G(\cdot,\cdot)$ with respect to a finite generating set of G. We denote the Gromov boundary of Γ_G by ∂G. For basic properties of Gromov hyperbolic spaces, hyperbolic groups and their Gromov boundaries, we refer the reader to [15, 13] and [18].

The following definition is due to Bowditch [9].

Definition 2.1. *When a group G acts on a compact metrisable space T by homeomorphisms, this action is called a convergence action if one of the following equivalent conditions holds.*

1. *Let $\Sigma_3(T)$ be a set $\{(x,y,z)\in T^3 \mid x\neq y, y\neq z, z\neq x\}$. Then the induced G-action on $\Sigma_3(T)$ is properly discontinuous.*
2. *For every sequence $\{g_n\}$ of distinct elements in G, we can find a subsequence $\{g_{n_i}\}$ and two points $x,y\in T$ such that $g_{n_i}|_{T\setminus\{x\}}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset to a constant map to y.*

We say that G is a convergence group if its action on some compact metrisable space T is a convergence action.

A convergence action is called *uniform* if the induced G-action on $\Sigma_3(T)$ is cocompact, i.e. the quotient space $\Sigma_3(T)/G$ is compact. When G is a hyperbolic group, ∂G has a natural topology which makes it a perfect compact metrisable space on which G-action is a uniform convergence action as was shown by Bowditch [9].

Definition 2.2. *When a group G acts on a compact metrisable space T as a convergence action, a point $x\in T$ is called a conical limit point if there exist distinct points y,z in T and a sequence $\{g_n\}$ of distinct elements of G such that $g_n x\to y$ and $g_n|_{T\setminus\{x\}}$ converges uniformly on every compact set to a constant map to z as $n\to\infty$.*

We need the following equivalent condition for a point to be a conical limit point.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G,T be as in Definition 2.2. A point $x\in T$ is a conical limit point if and only if the following condition holds. For any point $y\in T$ that is distinct from x, there exists a sequence $\{g_n\}$ of distinct elements of G such that $(g_n x, g_n y)\to(x_\infty, y_\infty)\in(T\times T)\setminus\Delta$ as $n\to\infty$ where Δ denotes the diagonal subset.*

Proof. A proof can be found in Bowditch [7]. We shall give a short proof for a later use. The necessity is clear, so that we only need to show the sufficiency of the condition. We assume that the condition in our statement holds, and let $\{g_n\}$ be a sequence as given in the statement. Since the G-action on T is a convergence action, we can find its subsequence $\{g_{n_i}\}$ such that either $g_{n_i}|_{T\setminus\{x\}}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset to a constant map to y_∞ or $g_{n_i}|_{T\setminus\{y\}}$ converges uniformly on every compact set to a constant map to x_∞. However the latter case cannot occur, for if the latter were true, $g_{n_i}z\to x_\infty$ as $n\to\infty$ for any $z\in T\setminus\{x,y\}$, which contradicts our assumption by setting y in the statement to be z here. Therefore we see that $g_{n_i}x\to x_\infty$ and $g_{n_i}|_{T\setminus\{x\}}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset to a constant map to y_∞. By letting x_∞ and y_∞ be y and z in Definition 2.2, we are done. □

Every conical limit point is contained in Λ_G. When G acts on a perfect compact metrisable space T as a convergence action, it is known that the

G-action is uniform if and only if every point in T is a conical limit point (see [9, 29, 18] for example). Thus in particular, every point on ∂G is conical for a hyperbolic group G.

Now let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G such that there exists a Cannon-Thurston map $\widehat{i} : \partial H \to \partial G$. We consider the H-action on ∂G and want to characterise the conical limit points with respect to this subgroup action. Note that Λ_H, the limit set of H coincides with the image of $\widehat{i}$. We can now prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First we shall show that all the points in $\{x \in \partial G \mid |\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)| = 1\}$ are conical.

Suppose not. Then, there exists a point $x \in \partial G$ with $|\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)| = 1$ which is not conical. Since x is not conical, there is $y \in \partial G$ distinct from x for which there is no sequence $\{g_n\}$ such that $\{(g_n x, g_n y)\}$ converges in $\partial G \times \partial G \setminus \Delta$. Choose some $y' \in \widehat{i}^{-1}(y)$. Then since $x' := \widehat{i}^{-1}(x)$ is a conical limit point in ∂H, there exists a sequence $\{h_n\}$ of distinct elements of H such that $(h_n x', h_n y') \to (x'_\infty, y'_\infty) \in (\partial H \times \partial H) \setminus \Delta$ as $n \to \infty$. On the other hand, by our choice of y, we see that $\{(h_n x, h_n y)\}$ converges to a point in Δ, say (x_∞, x_∞), after passing to a subsequence. Thus we have $\widehat{i}(x'_\infty) = \widehat{i}(y'_\infty) = x_\infty$. Now noting that $(h_n^{-1} x'_\infty, h_n^{-1} y'_\infty) \to (x', y')$ and that $\widehat{i}$ is an equivariant continuous map, we see that $\widehat{i}(x') = \widehat{i}(y')$, which contradicts our assumption that $x \neq y$.

Next we shall show that there are no conical limit points of H in the set $\{x \in \partial G \mid |\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)| \geq 2\}$. Suppose, seeking a contradiction, that there exists a conical limit point x such that $|\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)| \geq 2$. Choose $y \in \partial G$ such that $y \neq x$. Since x is conical with respect to the H-action on ∂G, by Lemma 2.3 there exists a sequence $\{h_n\} \subset H$ such that $(h_n x, h_n y) \to (x_\infty, y_\infty) \in (\partial G \times \partial G) \setminus \Delta$. We see by the proof of Lemma 2.3 that there is a subsequence $\{h_{n_i}\}$ of $\{h_n\}$ such that $\{h_{n_i}|_{\partial G \setminus \{x\}}\}$ converges to a constant map to y_∞ uniformly on every compact subset. Since the H-action on ∂H is a convergence action, we can find a further subsequence $\{h_{n_j}\}$ and $x', y'_\infty \in \partial H$ such that $\{h_{n_j}|_{\partial H \setminus \{x'\}}\}$ converges uniformly on every compact set to a constant map to y'_∞. Since $\{h_{n_j}|_{\partial G \setminus \{x\}}\}$ converges to a constant map to y_∞ and $\lim_{j \to \infty} h_{n_j} x = x_\infty \neq y_\infty$, by the continuity of $\widehat{i}$, this is possible only when $x' \in \widehat{i}^{-1}(x)$, $y'_\infty \in \widehat{i}^{-1}(y_\infty)$, and by taking a subsequence again, we can assume that $h_{n_j}(x') \to x'_\infty$ for some $x'_\infty \in \widehat{i}^{-1}(x_\infty)$. This means that for any $x'' \in \widehat{i}^{-1}(x)$ with $x'' \neq x'$, (which is guaranteed to exist because $|\widehat{i}^{-1}(x)| \geq 2$), we have$(h_{n_j} x', h_{n_j} x'') \to (x'_\infty, y'_\infty)$ as $j \to \infty$, and hence $\widehat{i}(x'_\infty) = \widehat{i}(y'_\infty)$, which contradicts the fact that $x_\infty \neq y_\infty$. $\square$

3. Existence of non-conical limit points

Recall that for $k \geq 0$, a subspace C in a geodesic metric space X is said to be *k-quasi-convex* if for all $x, y \in C$, any geodesic joining x, y is contained in the k-neighbourhood of C. We simply say that C is quasi-convex in X if

C is k-quasi-convex for some k. We say that a hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G is a *quasi-convex subgroup* if $i(\Gamma_H)$ is quasi-convex in Γ_G, where i is the inclusion as before. It is well known that H is quasi-convex if and only if Γ_H is quasi-isometrically embedded in Γ_G by i. (See [10, p. 461] for example). The following Proposition 3.1 shows that the limit set of an infinite index quasi-convex subgroup cannot fill the entire ∂G.

Proposition 3.1. *Let H be an infinite index hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G such that $\Lambda_H = \partial G$. Then H is not quasi-convex in G.*

Sketch of Proof. This was proved in [14, Lemma 2.9], and the key argument is as follows. Suppose that H is quasi-convex in G. Since H has infinite index in G, there exists a sequence $\{g_i\}$ in G such that $\{Hg_i\}$ forms a sequence of distinct right cosets. We can assume that the word length of g_{i+1} is greater than g_i so that $\{g_i\}$ converges to some point $x \in \partial G$ passing to a subsequence. By using the quasi-convexity of H and the hyperbolicity of Γ_G, we see that x cannot be contained in Λ_H, which is a contradiction. $\square$

We remark that by [5, Prop 5.5], the above Proposition 3.1 implies that when H is an infinite index subgroup of a hyperbolic group G with $\Lambda_H = \partial G$, the harmonic measure (see [16, 17, 5]) and the Patterson-Sullivan measure (see [27, 28, 12]) on ∂G are singular to each other. Here the harmonic measure is the limit law of a random walk with respect to a symmetric measure on H with finite support which generates H itself. The Patterson-Sullivan measure is with respect to the G-action on $\Gamma_G \cup \partial G$.

Now we conclude the paper with giving the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We denote by $d_G(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $d_H(\cdot,\cdot)$ the path metrics on the Cayley graphs Γ_G and Γ_H induced from the word metrics respectively. Since H is not quasi-convex in G, we can find two sequences of vertices $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}$ in Γ_H such that any geodesic segment $[i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$ joining $i(x_n)$ and $i(y_n)$ in Γ_G cannot be contained in the k_n-neighbourhood of $i(\Gamma_H)$ with $k_n \to \infty$. We also connect x_n and y_n on Γ_H by a geodesic $[x_n, y_n]_H$. Since $d_G(i(x_n), i(y_n)) \leq d_H(x_n, y_n)$, we see that $d_H(x_n, y_n) \to \infty$.

Let $p_n : \Gamma_G \to [i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$ be a nearest point projection. For each vertex $z \in [x_n, y_n]_H$, we consider its image $p_n(z)$. Since adjacent vertices of Γ_H are at the distance 1 also in Γ_G, by the δ-hyperbolicity of G, there is a constant K depending only on δ such that if z and z' are adjacent vertices on $[x_n, y_n]_H$, we have $d_G(p_n i(z), p_n i(z')) \leq K$. This implies the image of the vertices on $i([x_n, y_n]_H)$ under p_n is K-dense in $[i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$.

Since every point in a geodesic is within the distance 1/2 from a vertex, we can find a vertex $z_{n,G} \in [i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$ such that $d_G(z_{n,G}, i(\Gamma_H)) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. By the observation above, we can find a vertex $z_{n,H}$ on $[x_n, y_n]_H$ such that $d(i(z_{n,H}), [i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G) \geq d_G(z_{n,G}, i(\Gamma_H)) - K$. In particular, we have $d_G(i(z_{n,H}), [i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G) \to \infty$. This also implies that $d_H(z_{n,H}, x_n) \to \infty$ and $d_H(z_{n,H}, y_n) \to \infty$.

We translate $[x_n, y_n]_H$ and $[i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$ simultaneously by the H-action on Γ_G, and we can assume that $z_{n,H} = e$ for all n. Thus we get a sequence of vertices x_n, y_n on Γ_H such that $e \in [x_n, y_n]_H$, $d(e, x_n) \to \infty$, $d(e, y_n) \to \infty$, and the distance between the geodesic segment $[i(x_n), i(y_n)]_G$ and e in Γ_G goes to infinity. The last condition implies that $(i(x_n)|i(y_n))_e \to \infty$, and hence $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ converge to the same point in ∂G, which we denote by q. On the other hand $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ converges to distinct points of ∂H, say x_∞ and y_∞, since the geodesic connecting them passes through e. Since the Cannon-Thurston map is a continuous extension, this implies that $\widehat{i}(x_\infty) = \widehat{i}(y_\infty) = q$, and hence $|\widehat{i}^{-1}(q)| \geq 2$. Therefore, by Theorem 1.1, $q \in \partial G$ is a non-conical limit point of H. $\square$

References

[1] O. Baker and T. R. Riley, *Cannon-Thurston maps do not always exist*, arXiv:1206.0505 (2012).

[2] O. Baker and T. R. Riley, *Cannon-Thurston maps, subgroup distortion and hyperbolic hydra*, arXiv:1209.0815 (2012).

[3] A. Beardon and B. Maskit, *Limit points of Kleinian groups and finite sided fundamental polyhedra*, Acta Math. 132. (1974), 1-12.

[4] C. J. Bishop, *On a theorem of Beardon and Maskit*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. Vol. 21 (1996), 383-388.

[5] S. Blachère, P. Haïssinsky and P. Mathieu, *Harmonic measures versus quasiconformal measures for hyperbolic groups*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 44 (2011), 683-721.

[6] B. H. Bowditch, *Geometrical finiteness with variable negative curvature*, Duke Math. J. Volume 77, Number 1 (1995), 229-274.

[7] B. H. Bowditch, *Convergence groups and configuration spaces*, in Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996), 23-54, de Gruyter, Berlin (1999).

[8] B. H. Bowditch, *The Cannon-Thurston map for punctured surface groups*, Math. Z. 255 (2007), 35-76.

[9] B. H. Bowditch, *A topological characterisation of hyperbolic groups*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 11, no. 3 (1998), 643-667.

[10] M. R. Bridson, A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Springer(1999).

[11] J. Cannon and W. P. Thurston, *Group invariant Peano Curves*, Geometry and Topology 11 (2007), 1315-1356.

[12] M. Coornaert, *Mesures de Patterson-Sullivan sur le bord d'un espace hyperbolique au sens de Gromov*, Pac. J. Math. 159, no. 2 (1993), 241-270.

[13] E. Ghys and P. de la Harpe, editors. *Sur les Groups Hyperbolic d'après Mikhael Gromov*, vol. 83 of Progress in Mathematics. Birkhäuser, (1990).

[14] R. Gitik, M. Mitra, E. Rips and M. Sageev, *Width of subgroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 350 (1998), 321-328.

[15] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*, In S. M. Gersten, editor, Essays in group theory, volume 8 of MSRI publications (1987), 75-263. Springer-Verlag.

[16] V. A. Kaimanovich, *Poisson boundaries of hyperbolic groups*, C. R. Ac. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 318 (1994), 59-64.

[17] V. A. Kaimanovich, *The Poisson formula for groups with hyperbolic properties*, Ann. of Math. 152 (2000), 659-692.

[18] I. Kapovich and N. Benakli, *Boundaries of hyperbolic groups*, In Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001), volume 296 of Contemp. Math., 39-93. Amer. Math. Soc., (2002) Providence, RI.

[19] Y. Matsuda and S. Oguni, *On Cannon-Thurston maps for relatively hyperbolic groups*, arXiv:1206.5868 (2012).
[20] C. McMullen, *Local connectivity, Kleinian groups and geodesics on the blow-up of the torus*, Invent. math. 97 (2000), 95-127.
[21] Y. N. Minsky, *On rigidity, limit sets and end invariants of hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (1994), 539-588.
[22] M. Mitra, *Cannon-Thurston maps for hyperbolic group extensions*, Topology, 37(3) (1998), 527-538.
[23] M. Mitra, *Cannon-Thurston maps for trees of hyperbolic metric spaces*, J. Differential Geometry, 48 (1998), 135-164.
[24] M. Mj, *Cannon-Thurston map for Surface groups*, preprint, arXiv:math.GT/0511041 (2006).
[25] M. Mj, *Cannon-Thurston maps for Kleinian groups*, preprint, arXiv:1002.0996.
[26] M. Mj, *Cannon-Thurston maps for pared manifolds of bounded geometry*, Geometry and Topology 13 (2009), 189-245.
[27] S. J. Patterson, *The limit set of a fuchsian group*, Acta math. 136 (1976), 241-273.
[28] D. Sullivan, *The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions*, Publ. math. IHES 50 (1979), 171-202.
[29] P. Tukia, *Conical limit points and uniform convergence groups*, J. reine, angew. Math. 501 (1998), 71-98.

Woojin Jeon
School of Mathematics
KIAS, Hoegiro 87, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul, 130-722, Korea
`jwoojin@kias.re.kr`

Ken'ichi Ohshika
Department of Mathematics
Graduate School of Science
Osaka University Toyanaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan
`ohshika@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`